

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

DAWN BALL,	:	CIVIL NO. 1:08-CV-700
	:	
Plaintiff	:	(Chief Judge Kane)
	:	
v.	:	
	:	(Magistrate Judge Carlson)
DR. FAMIGLIO, et al.,	:	
	:	
Defendants	:	

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

I. Statement of Facts and of the Case

This matter comes before the court for consideration of a motion for preliminary injunctive relief filed by the plaintiff, Dawn Ball, an inmate currently incarcerated at the State Correctional Institution at Muncy (“SCI-Muncy”). In her Second Amended Complaint, the Plaintiff alleged that she was denied dental and medical care while at SCI-Muncy in 2007. (Doc. 86.) Specifically, Ball alleged that she has been refused partial dentures and tooth cleaning, and has been denied a cane and wheelchair.(Id.) Ball also alleged that staff refused to let her go to physical therapy; stopped providing her with some unidentified medications; only permitted to have her teeth cleaned once every two years; refused to order her dentures and perform a root canal; and have not permitted her to brush her teeth many times. (Id.)

While the parties have been litigating the merits of these claims, Ball has filed a motion for preliminary injunction, (Doc. 125), which invites the Court to grant her

preliminary injunctive relief which goes directly to the ultimate issues in this lawsuit, by both prescribing specific forms of medical treatment for Ball, and by ordering her transfer to another prison. (*Id.*) The defendants have responded to the motion. (Docs. 137 and 138.) Therefore this motion is ripe for resolution.

For the reasons set forth below, it is recommended that this motion be denied.

II. Discussion

A. Preliminary Injunction Rule 65– The Legal Standard.

Inmate *pro se* pleadings, like those filed here, which seek extraordinary, or emergency relief, in the form of preliminary injunctions are governed by Rule 65 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and are judged against exacting legal standards. As the United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit has explained: “Four factors govern a district court’s decision whether to issue a preliminary injunction: (1) whether the movant has shown a reasonable probability of success on the merits; (2) whether the movant will be irreparably injured by denial of the relief, (3) whether granting preliminary relief will result in even greater harm to the nonmoving party; and (4) whether granting the preliminary relief will be in the public interest.” Gerardi v. Pelullo, 16 F.3d 1363, 1373 (3d Cir. 1994) (quoting SI Handling Systems, Inc. v. Heisley, 753 F.2d 1244, 1254 (3d Cir. 1985)). See also Highmark, Inc. v. UPMC Health Plan, Inc., 276 F.3d 160, 170-71 (3d Cir. 2001); Emile v. SCI-Pittsburgh, No.

04-974, 2006 WL 2773261, *6 (W.D.Pa. Sept. 24, 2006)(denying inmate preliminary injunction).

A preliminary injunction is not granted as a matter of right. Kerschner v. Mazurkewicz, 670 F.2d 440, 443 (3d Cir. 1982) (affirming denial of prisoner motion for preliminary injunction seeking greater access to legal materials). It is an extraordinary remedy. Given the extraordinary nature of this form of relief, a motion for preliminary injunction places precise burdens on the moving party. As a threshold matter, “it is a movant's burden to show that the ‘preliminary injunction must be the only way of protecting the plaintiff from harm.’ ” Emile, 2006 WL 2773261, at * 6 (quoting Campbell Soup Co. v. ConAgra, Inc., 977 F.2d 86, 91 (3d Cir.1992)). Thus, when considering such requests, courts are cautioned that:

“[A] preliminary injunction is an extraordinary and drastic remedy, one that should not be granted unless the movant, by a clear showing, carries the burden of persuasion.” Mazurek v. Armstrong, 520 U.S. 968, 972 (1997) (emphasis deleted). Furthermore, the Court must recognize that an “[i]njunction is an equitable remedy which should not be lightly indulged in, but used sparingly and only in a clear and plain case.” Plain Dealer Publishing Co. v. Cleveland Typographical Union # 53, 520 F.2d 1220, 1230 (6th Cir.1975), cert. denied, 428 U.S. 909 (1977). As a corollary to the principle that preliminary injunctions should issue only in a clear and plain case, the Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit has observed that “upon an application for a preliminary injunction to doubt is to deny.” Madison Square Garden Corp. v. Braddock, 90 F.2d 924, 927 (3d Cir.1937).

Emile, 2006 WL 2773261, at *6.

Accordingly, for an inmate to sustain her burden of proof that she is entitled to a preliminary injunction under Fed.R.Civ.P. 65, she must demonstrate both a reasonable likelihood of success on the merits, and that she will be irreparably harmed if the requested relief is not granted. Abu-Jamal v. Price, 154 F.3d 128, 133 (3d Cir. 1998); Kershner, 670 F.2d at 443. If the movant fails to carry this burden on either of these elements, the motion should be denied since a party seeking such relief must "demonstrate *both* a likelihood of success on the merits and the probability of irreparable harm if relief is not granted." Hohe v. Casey, 868 F.2d 69, 72 (3d Cir. 1989)(emphasis in original), (quoting Morton v. Beyer, 822 F.2d 364 (3d Cir. 1987)).

These limitations on the power of courts to enter injunctions in a correctional context are further underscored by statute. Specifically, 18 U.S.C. §3626, limits the authority of courts to enjoin the exercise of discretion by prison officials, and provides that:

Prospective relief in any civil action with respect to prison conditions shall extend no further than necessary to correct the violation of the Federal right of a particular plaintiff or plaintiffs. The court shall not grant or approve any prospective relief unless the court finds that such relief is narrowly drawn, extends no further than necessary to correct the violation of the Federal right, and is the least intrusive means necessary to correct the violation of the Federal right. The court shall give substantial weight to any adverse impact on public safety or the operation of a criminal justice system caused by the relief.

18 U.S.C.A. § 3626(a)(1)(A).

With respect to preliminary injunctions sought by inmates, courts are also instructed that:

Preliminary injunctive relief must be narrowly drawn, extend no further than necessary to correct the harm the court finds requires preliminary relief, and be the least intrusive means necessary to correct that harm. The court shall give substantial weight to any adverse impact on public safety or the operation of a criminal justice system caused by the preliminary relief and shall respect the principles of comity . . . in tailoring any preliminary relief.

18 U.S.C.A. § 3626(a)(2).

Furthermore, several other basic legal tenets guide our discretion in this particular case, where an inmate: (1) requests injunctive relief of a presumably permanent nature without first fully exhausting administrative remedies; and (2) requests relief which goes beyond merely preserving the *status quo* in this litigation, but seeks to impose new, mandatory conditions on prison officials. Each of these aspects of Ball's prayer for injunctive relief presents separate problems and concerns.

At the outset, a request for some form of mandatory proactive injunctive relief in the prison context "must always be viewed with great caution because judicial restraint is especially called for in dealing with the complex and intractable problems of prison administration." Goff v. Harper, 60 F.3d 518 (3d Cir. 1995). Moreover, where a prisoner-plaintiff seeks injunctive relief of a presumably permanent or enduring nature, as Ball does in this case, the plaintiff's failure to timely exhaust her

administrative remedies may have substantive significance since the Prison Litigation Reform Act provides that “[n]o action shall be brought with respect to prison conditions under . . . [42 U.S.C. § 1983], or any other Federal law, by a prisoner confined in any jail, prison, or other correctional facility until such administrative remedies as are available are exhausted.” 42 U.S.C. § 1997e(a). Section 1997e’s exhaustion requirement applies to a wide-range of inmate complaints, including complaints like those made here grounded in alleged violations of the Eighth Amendment. See Spruill v. Gillis, 372 F.3d 218 (3d Cir. 2004); Booth v. Churner, 206 F.3d 289 (3d Cir. 2000). While this exhaustion requirement is not a jurisdictional bar to litigation, this requirement is strictly enforced by the courts. This rigorous enforcement is mandated by a fundamental recognition that § 1997e’s exhaustion requirement promotes important public policies. Nyhuis v. Reno, 204 F.3d 65, 75-76 (3d Cir. 2000)(citations omitted). Because of the important policies fostered by this exhaustion requirement, it has been held that there is no futility exception to § 1997e’s exhaustion requirement. Id. Instead, courts have typically required across-the-board administrative exhaustion by inmate plaintiffs who seek to pursue claims in federal court. Moreover, courts have also imposed a procedural default component on this exhaustion requirement, holding that inmates must fully satisfy the administrative requirements of the inmate grievance process before proceeding into federal court. Spruill v. Gillis, 372 F.3d 218 (3d Cir. 2004). Applying this procedural default

standard to § 1997e's exhaustion requirement, courts have concluded that inmates who fail to fully, or timely, complete the prison grievance process are barred from subsequently litigating claims in federal court; see, e.g., Booth v. Churner, 206 F.3d 289 (3d Cir. 2000); Bolla v. Strickland, 304 F. App'x 22 (3d Cir. 2008); Jetter v. Beard, 183 F. App'x 178 (3d Cir. 2006), including requests for injunctive relief in a prison context. Ghana v. Holland, 226 F.3d 175 (3d Cir. 2000).

In addition, to the extent that the plaintiff seeks a preliminary injunction with some enduring effect, she must show that she will be irreparably injured by the denial of this extraordinary relief. With respect to this benchmark standard for a preliminary injunction, in this context it is clear that:

Irreparable injury is established by showing that Plaintiff will suffer harm that "cannot be redressed by a legal or an equitable remedy following trial." Instant Air Freight Co. v. C.F. Air Freight, Inc., 882 F.2d 797, 801 (3d Cir.1989) ("The preliminary injunction must be the only way of protecting the plaintiff from harm"). Plaintiff bears this burden of showing irreparable injury. Hohe v. Casey, 868 F.2d 69, 72 (3d Cir.), cert. denied, 493 U.S. 848, 110 S.Ct. 144, 107 L.Ed.2d 102 (1989). In fact, the Plaintiff must show *immediate* irreparable injury, which is more than merely serious or substantial harm. ECRI v. McGraw-Hill, Inc., 809 F.2d 223, 226 (3d Cir.1987). The case law provides some assistance in determining that injury which is irreparable under this standard. "The word irreparable connotes 'that which cannot be repaired, retrieved, put down again, atoned for ...'." Acierno v. New Castle County, 40 F.3d 645, 653 (3d Cir.1994) (citations omitted). Additionally, "the claimed injury cannot merely be possible, speculative or remote." Dice v. Clinicorp, Inc., 887 F.Supp. 803, 809 (W.D.Pa.1995). An injunction is not issued "simply to eliminate the possibility of a remote future injury ..." Acierno, 40 F.3d at 655 (citation omitted).

Messner, 2009 WL 1406986, at *4 .

Furthermore, it is well-settled that “[t]he purpose of a preliminary injunction is to preserve the *status quo*, not to decide the issues on their merits.” Anderson v. Davila, 125 F.3d 148, 156 (3d Cir. 1997). Therefore, in a case such as this, where the inmate-“Plaintiff's request for immediate relief in his motion for preliminary injunction necessarily seeks resolution of one of the ultimate issues presented in [the] . . . Complaint, . . . [the] Plaintiff cannot demonstrate that he will suffer irreparable harm if he is not granted a preliminary injunction, because the ultimate issue presented will be decided either by this Court, upon consideration of Defendants' motion to dismiss, or at trial. As a result, Plaintiff's motion for preliminary injunction should be denied.”

Messner, 2009 WL 1406986, at *5.

Additionally, in assessing a motion for preliminary injunction, the court must also consider the possible harm to other interested parties if the relief is granted. Kershner, 670 F.2d at 443. Finally, a party who seeks an injunction must show that the issuance of the injunctive relief would not be adverse to the public interest. Emile, 2006 WL 2773261, at * 6 (citing Dominion Video Satellite, Inc. v. Echostar Corp., 269 F.3d 1149, 1154 (10th Cir. 2001)).

B. Ball's Request For Injunctive Relief Should Be Denied

1. Ball's Has Not Shown A Likelihood of Success on the Merits of Her Claims

Judged against these exacting standards, in its current form, Ball's motion for preliminary injunctive relief fails. In this case our review of the plaintiff's motion for preliminary injunction leads us to conclude that Ball has not made the demanding showing required by Rule 65 for this extraordinary form of relief. At the outset, we find that Ball has not yet met her threshold obligation of showing reasonable probability of success on the merits. With respect to the issue of Ball's ultimate likelihood of success on the merits of this case, we begin by observing that gravamen of Ball's complaint is that prison officials have violated her rights under the Eighth Amendment to the United States Constitution by displaying "deliberate indifference" to this inmate's medical needs. Ball faces an exacting burden in advancing this Eighth Amendment claim against prison officials in their individual capacities. To sustain such a claim, Ball must plead facts which:

[M]eet two requirements: (1) "the deprivation alleged must be, objectively, sufficiently serious;" and (2) the "prison official must have a sufficiently culpable state of mind." Farmer v. Brennan, 511 U.S. 825, 834, 114 S.Ct. 1970, 128 L.Ed.2d 811 (1994) (quotation marks and citations omitted). In prison conditions cases, "that state of mind is one of 'deliberate indifference' to inmate health or safety." Id. "Deliberate indifference" is a subjective standard under Farmer—the prison official-defendant must actually have known or been aware of the excessive risk to inmate safety.

Beers-Capitol v. Whetzel, 256 F.3d 120, 125 (3d Cir. 2001).

By including a subjective intent component in this Eighth Amendment benchmark, the courts have held that a mere generalized knowledge that prisons are dangerous places does not give rise to an Eighth Amendment claim. See Jones v. Beard, 145 F. App'x 743 (3d Cir. 2005)(finding no Eighth Amendment violation where inmate-plaintiff complained about cellmate who had a history of psychological problems, but where plaintiff failed to articulate a specific threat of harm during the weeks prior to an attack.) In short, when “analyzing deliberate indifference, a court must determine whether the prison official ‘acted or failed to act despite his knowledge of a substantial risk of serious harm.’ Farmer v. Brennan, 511 U.S. 825, 841 (1994). A prisoner plaintiff must prove that the prison official ‘knows of and disregards an excessive risk to inmate health or safety.’ Id. at 837.” Garvey v. Martinez, 08-2217, 2010 WL 569852, at *6 (M.D.Pa. Feb. 11, 2010).

These principles apply with particular force to Eighth Amendment claims premised upon inadequate medical care. In the medical context, a constitutional violation under the Eighth Amendment occurs only when state officials are deliberately indifferent to an inmate's serious medical needs. Estelle v. Gamble, 429 U.S. 97, 105 (1976). To establish a violation of his constitutional right to adequate medical care in accordance with this standard, Ball is required to allege facts that demonstrate (1) a serious medical need, and (2) acts or omissions by prison officials that indicate deliberate indifference to that need. Rouse v. Plantier, 182 F.3d 192, 197 (3d Cir.

1999). Deliberate indifference to a serious medical need involves the “unnecessary and wanton infliction of pain.” Estelle, 429 U.S. at 104. Such indifference may be evidenced by an intentional refusal to provide care, delayed provision of medical treatment for non-medical reasons, denial of prescribed medical treatment, denial of reasonable requests for treatment that results in suffering or risk of injury, Durmer v. O’Carroll, 991 F.2d 64, 68 (3d Cir. 1993), or “persistent conduct in the face of resultant pain and risk of permanent injury,” White v. Napoleon, 897 F.2d 103, 109 (3d Cir. 1990).

However, it is also clear that the mere misdiagnosis of a condition or medical need, or negligent treatment provided for a condition, is not actionable as an Eighth Amendment claim because medical malpractice standing alone is not a constitutional violation. Estelle, 429 U.S. at 106. “Indeed, prison authorities are accorded considerable latitude in the diagnosis and treatment of prisoners.” Durmer, 991 F.2d at 67 (citations omitted). Furthermore, in a prison medical context, deliberate indifference is generally not found when some significant level of medical care has been offered to the inmate. Clark v. Doe, 2000 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 14999, 2000 WL 1522855, at *2 (E.D.Pa. Oct. 13, 2000)(“courts have consistently rejected Eighth Amendment claims where an inmate has received some level of medical care”). Thus, such complaints fail as constitutional claims under § 1983 since “the exercise by a doctor of his professional judgment is never deliberate indifference. See e.g. Brown v.

Borough of Chambersburg, 903 F.2d 274, 278 (3d Cir.1990) ('[A]s long as a physician exercises professional judgment his behavior will not violate a prisoner's constitutional rights.'"). Gindraw v. Dendler, 967 F.Supp. 833, 836 (E.D. Pa. 1997).

Applying this exacting standard, courts have frequently rejected Eighth Amendment claims that are based upon the level of professional care that an inmate received; see, e.g., Ham v. Greer, 269 F. App'x 149 (3d Cir. 2008); James v. Dep't of Corrections, 230 F. App'x 195 (3d. Cir. 2007); Gillespie v. Hogan, 182 F. App'x 103 (3d Cir. 2006); Bronson v. White, No. 05-2150, 2007 WL 3033865 (M.D. Pa. Oct. 15, 2007); Gindraw v. Dendler, 967 F.Supp. 833 (E.D. Pa. 1997), particularly where it can be shown that significant medical services were provided to the inmate but the prisoner is dissatisfied with the outcome of these services. Instead, courts have defined the precise burden which an inmate must sustain in order to advance an Eighth Amendment claim against a healthcare professional premised on allegedly inadequate care, stating that:

The district court [may] properly dis[miss an] Eighth Amendment claim, as it concerned [a care giver], because [the] allegations merely amounted to a disagreement over the proper course of his treatment and thus failed to allege a reckless disregard with respect to his . . . care. The standard for cruel and unusual punishment under the Eighth Amendment, established by the Supreme Court in Estelle v. Gamble, 429 U.S. 97, 104 (1976), and its progeny, has two prongs: 1) deliberate indifference by prison officials and 2) serious medical needs. "It is well-settled that claims of negligence or medical malpractice, without some more culpable state of mind, do not constitute 'deliberate indifference.' " "Nor does mere disagreement as to the proper medical treatment support a claim of

an eighth amendment violation.” . . . [The inmate] alleged no undue delay in receiving treatment and, as the district court noted, the evidence he presented established that he received timely care . . . Although [an inmate plaintiff] may have preferred a different course of treatment, [t]his preference alone cannot establish deliberate indifference as such second-guessing is not the province of the courts.

James, 230 F.App’x. at 197-198.(citations omitted).

Furthermore, it is well-settled that an inmate’s dissatisfaction with a course of medical treatment, standing alone, does not give rise to a viable Eighth Amendment claim. See Taylor v. Norris, 36 F. App’x 228, 229 (8th Cir. 2002); Abdul-Wadood v. Nathan, 91 F.3d 1023, 1024-35 (7th Cir.1996); Sherrer v. Stephen, 50 F.3d 496, 497 (8th Cir.1994); Kayser v. Caspari, 16 F.3d 280, 281 (8th Cir.1994). Therefore, where a dispute in essence entails nothing more than a disagreement between an inmate and doctors over alternate treatment plans, the inmate’s complaint will fail as a constitutional claim under § 1983; see e.g., Gause v. Diguglielmo, 339 F.App’x 132 (3d Cir. 2009)(dispute over choice of medication does not rise to the level of an Eighth Amendment violation); Innis v. Wilson, 334 F.App’x 454 (3d Cir. 2009)(same); Rozzelle v. Rossi, 307 F.App’x 640 (3d Cir. 2008)(same); Whooten v. Bussanich, 248 F.App’x 324 (3d Cir. 2007)(same); Ascenzi v. Diaz, 247 F.App’x 390 (3d Cir. 2007)(same), since “the exercise by a doctor of his professional judgment is never deliberate indifference.” Gindraw v. Dendler, 967 F.Supp. 833, 836 (E.D. Pa. 1997)(citations omitted). In short, in the context of the Eighth Amendment, any attempt

to second-guess the propriety or adequacy of a particular course of treatment is disavowed by courts since such determinations remain a question of sound professional medical judgment. Inmates of Allegheny County Jail v. Pierce, 612 F.2d 754, 762 (3d Cir. 1979) (quoting Bowring v. Godwin, 551 F.2d 44, 48 (4th Cir. 1977)).

These guiding principles, which determine the ultimate merits of inmate Eighth Amendment claims, also frequently define the availability of preliminary injunctive relief in such cases. State inmates in Pennsylvania have in the past often invited federal courts to entertain preliminary injunctions directing their jailers to provide them with specially tailored treatment protocols. Yet, these requests, while frequently made, have rarely been embraced by the courts. Rivera v. Pennsylvania Dep’t. Of Corrections, 346 F.App’x 749 (3d Cir. 2009); Rush v. Correctional Medical Services, Inc., 287 F.App’x 142 (3d Cir. 2008); Quinn v. Palakovich, 204 F. App’x 116 (3d Cir. 2006). Therefore, to the extent that Ball invites the court to prescribe a specific course of medical treatment for her by judicial fiat while this lawsuit is pending, it is recommended that the court decline this invitation since the likelihood of success on the merits of these claims has not been demonstrated by the plaintiff.

Furthermore, to the extent that Ball appears to request an order directing that she be transferred to some other prison, it is well established that the United States Constitution does not confer any right upon an inmate to any particular custody or security classification. Moody v. Daggett, 429 U.S. 78, 88 (1976); Montanye v.

Haymes, 427 U.S. 236, 242 (1976). Thus, inmates do not have a liberty interest in retaining or receiving any particular security or custody status “[a]s long as the [challenged] conditions or degree of confinement is within the sentence imposed ... and is not otherwise violative of the Constitution.” Id. Similarly, it has long been recognized that prison transfer decisions, standing alone, do not constitute cruel and unusual punishment in violation of the Eighth Amendment to the Constitution. See, e.g., Hassain v. Johnson, 790 F.2d 1420 (9th Cir. 1986); Serrano v. Torres, 764 F.2d 47 (1st Cir. 1985). Thus, even inmate transfers to facilities far from their homes do not rise to the level of cruel and unusual punishment. See, e.g., Gov’t of Virgin Island v. Gereau, 592 F.2d 192 (3d Cir. 1979)(transfer from Virgin Islands to mainland); Rodriguez-Sandoval v. United States, 409 F.2d 529 (1st Cir. 1969)(transfer from Puerto Rico to Atlanta). In sum, well-settled law establishes that prisoners have no inherent constitutional right to placement in any particular prison, to any security classification, or to any particular housing assignment. See Olim v. Wakinekona, 461 U.S. 238, 245 (1983); Meachum v. Fano, 427 U.S. 215 225 (1976); Montanye, 427 U.S. at 242; Bulger v. U.S. Bureau of Prisons, 65 F.3d 48 (5th Cir. 1995); Marchesani v. McCune, 531 F.2d 459 (10th Cir.), cert. denied, 429 U.S. 846 (1976). Simply put, as a legal matter Ball has no constitutional right to choose her prison. Therefore, she may not use a motion for preliminary injunction as a vehicle to choose her place of confinement, or direct a prison transfer, in the course of this litigation. Given these

existing legal impediments to Ball's prison transfer claims, we cannot find that Ball has shown a likelihood of success on the merits of these claims.

2. Ball's Motion Does Not Comply With the Procedural Requirements Set By Statute For Inmate Injunctive Relief

Beyond this failure to demonstrate a likelihood of success on the merits, Ball's motion for injunctive relief is wanting in several other respects. For example, the motion does not address the demanding standards prescribed by caselaw and statute for such injunctions, in that the plaintiff does not present a prayer for relief which is "narrowly drawn, extend[s] no further than necessary to correct the harm . . . , and [is] the least intrusive means necessary to correct that harm." 18 U.S.C. §3626(a)(2). Quite the contrary, this prayer for relief is cast broadly and would invite the court to intervene in prison custody, care and transfer issues in a particularly intrusive and inappropriate way. Nor does the motion explain whether, and to what extent, administrative relief has been sought, and exhausted, with respect to these matters.

In addition, Ball has not met the legal standards for an injunction against non-parties, like some of the injunctive relief sought here by Ball. Such an injunction—which would presumably require us to direct non-party prison officials to house this inmate—require a specific legal showing. To the extent that Ball seeks to enjoin non-parties in this litigation it is clear that: “[a] non-party cannot be bound by the terms of an injunction unless the non-party is found to be acting ‘in active concert or

participation' with the party against whom injunctive relief is sought. Fed.R.Civ.P. 65(d)." Elliott v. Kiesewetter, 98 F.3d 47, 56 (3d Cir. 1996). Further, where the requested preliminary injunction "is directed not merely at preserving the *status quo* but...at providing mandatory relief, the burden on the moving party is particularly heavy." Punnett v. Carter, 621 F.2d 578, 582 (3d Cir. 1980). Mandatory injunctions should be used sparingly. United States v. Price, 688 F.2d 204, 212 (3d Cir. 1982). Indeed, a request for some form of mandatory proactive injunctive relief in the prison context "must always be viewed with great caution because judicial restraint is especially called for in dealing with the complex and intractable problems of prison administration." Goff v. Harper, 60 F.3d 518 (3d Cir. 1995).

In this setting, Ball's failure to address these important procedural matters has substantive significance to the extent that she seeks a permanent injunction of some sort from the court, and strongly caution against granting the plaintiff this extraordinary form of relief.

3. Ball Has Failed to Show Irreparable Harm

Moreover, while we do not in any way diminish Ball's complaints, we find—as many other courts have found when presented with similar complaints—that this inmate has not shown an immediate irreparable harm justifying a preliminary injunction. See

e.g., Rivera v. Pennsylvania Dep't of Corrections, 346 F. App'x 749 (3d Cir. 2009) (denying inmate request for injunction); Rush v. Correctional Medical Services, Inc., 287 F. App'x 142 (3d Cir. 2008)(same). In this regard, when considering this benchmark standard for a preliminary injunction, it is clear that: “Irreparable injury is established by showing that Plaintiff will suffer harm that ‘cannot be redressed by a legal or an equitable remedy following trial.’ Instant Air Freight Co. v. C.F. Air Freight, Inc., 882 F.2d 797, 801 (3d Cir.1989) (‘The preliminary injunction must be the only way of protecting the plaintiff from harm’).” Messner, 2009 WL 1406986, at *4 . Moreover, in this context, the word irreparable has a specific meaning and connotes “that which cannot be repaired, retrieved, put down again, [or] atoned for” Acierno v. New Castle County, 40 F.3d 645, 653 (3d Cir.1994) (citations omitted). Thus, an injunction will not issue “simply to eliminate the possibility of a remote future injury ...” Acierno, 40 F.3d at 655 (citation omitted). Therefore, where an inmate-plaintiff is alleging that damages may be an adequate remedy, a preliminary injunction is often not appropriate since the inmate has not shown that she faces immediate, irreparable harm. Rivera v. Pennsylvania Dep't. Of Corrections, 346 F. App'x 749 (3d Cir. 2009); Rush v. Correctional Medical Services, Inc., 287 F. App'x 142 (3d Cir. 2008).

Applying these legal standards in a case such as this, where the inmate-“Plaintiff's request for immediate relief in his motion for preliminary injunction necessarily seeks resolution of one of the ultimate issues presented in [the] . . .

Complaint, . . . [the] Plaintiff cannot demonstrate that he will suffer irreparable harm if he is not granted a preliminary injunction, because the ultimate issue presented will be decided either by this Court, upon consideration of Defendants' motion to dismiss, or at trial. As a result, Plaintiff's motion for preliminary injunction should be denied."

Messner, 2009 WL 1406986, at *5. In this case, as we view it, much of the injunctive relief sought by Ball directly relates to the merits of the ultimate issues in this lawsuit. Since the ultimate issues in this lawsuit are inextricably intertwined with the assertions in these motions for injunctive relief, a ruling on the motion might be perceived as speaking in some way to the ultimate issues in this case. In such instances we should refrain from prematurely granting such relief.

4. **Granting This Injunctive Relief Would Harm the Interest of Other Parties and the Public**

Further, we note that granting this injunctive relief, which would effectively have the federal courts making *ad hoc*, and individual, decisions concerning the treatment of a single prisoner, could harm both the defendants' and the public's interest. In this prison context, the defendants' interests and the public's interest in penological order could be adversely effected if the Court began dictating the housing or medical treatment for the plaintiff, one inmate out of thousands treated in the state prison system. Therefore, consideration of "whether granting preliminary relief will result in even greater harm to the nonmoving party; and . . . whether granting the

preliminary relief will be in the public interest," Gerardi v. Pelullo, 16 F.3d 1363, 1373 (3d Cir. 1994), weighs heavily against Ball in this case.

In sum, in this case Ball has not demonstrated a likelihood of success on the merits, and has not shown that she suffers an irreparable harm. Moreover, Ball's motion is procedurally flawed, and granting Ball this extraordinary relief could harm the public's interest and the interests of the opposing parties. Therefore, an assessment of the factors which govern issuance of such relief under Rule 65 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure weighs against Ball and compels the court to deny this motion.

III. Recommendation

Accordingly, for the foregoing reasons, upon consideration of the motion for preliminary injunction, (Doc. 125) IT IS RECOMMENDED that the motion be DENIED.

The parties are further placed on notice that pursuant to Local Rule 72.3:

Any party may object to a magistrate judge's proposed findings, recommendations or report addressing a motion or matter described in 28 U.S.C. § 636 (b)(1)(B) or making a recommendation for the disposition of a prisoner case or a habeas corpus petition within fourteen (14) days after being served with a copy thereof. Such party shall file with the clerk of court, and serve on the magistrate judge and all parties, written objections which shall specifically identify the portions of the proposed findings, recommendations or report to which objection is made and the basis for such objections. The briefing requirements set forth in Local Rule 72.2 shall apply. A judge shall make a de novo determination of those portions of the report or specified proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made and may accept, reject, or

modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate judge. The judge, however, need conduct a new hearing only in his or her discretion or where required by law, and may consider the record developed before the magistrate judge, making his or her own determination on the basis of that record. The judge may also receive further evidence, recall witnesses or recommit the matter to the magistrate judge with instructions.

So ordered this 7th day of October, 2011.

S/MARTIN C. CARLSON

Martin C. Carlson

United States Magistrate Judge